

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

RONALD JERRELL INMAN,
Plaintiff,

v.

DARRIN BRIGHT, et al.,
Defendants.

Case No. [15-cv-01767-SI](#)

SCHEDULING ORDER

Re: Dkt. No. 15

Defendants have filed a request for an extension of the deadline to file an opposition to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment, asking that the deadline for them to file an opposition to plaintiff's motion for summary judgment be delayed for 30 days or until after the court rules on their earlier-filed motion to dismiss. Upon due consideration of the request and attached declaration of attorney William Buranich, defendants' request for an extension of the deadline is GRANTED. Docket No. 15. When the court rules on defendants' motion to dismiss, it will set new deadlines for defendants' opposition to, and plaintiff's reply in support of, plaintiff's motion for summary judgment.

Plaintiff sent a letter expressing concern that he may not have received a document because William Buranich's declaration referred to a document "that accompanied [plaintiff's] opposition to defendants' motion to dismiss in which 'responses due by 3/3/2016 and replies due by 3/17/2016' was cited." Docket # 19. Plaintiff failed to read the Buranich declaration carefully; paragraph 4 of that declaration refers to a docket entry rather than a document. There was no document for plaintiff to receive because the notation was only a computer-generated entry in the

1 court's docket that sets briefing schedules automatically upon the filing of a dispositive motion.

2 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

3 Dated: March 7, 2016



4
5 SUSAN ILLSTON
United States District Judge
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28